

forth in the Office Action. In a telephonic interview conducted on August 31, 2006, Examiner Jones revised the restriction requirement to read follows:

Claims 1-18 and 28-49 are linking claims that will be searched in addition to the Group that is selected below. The invention Groups are:

I. Claims 19 and 20, drawn to methods of combination treatment with an antimuscarinic agent;

II. Claims 21 and 22, drawn to methods of combination treatment with an alpha 1 adrenergic antagonist;

III. Claim 23, drawn to methods of combination treatment with a COX2 inhibitor;

IV. Claims 24 and 25, drawn to methods of combination treatment with a selective COX1/COX2 inhibitor;

V. Claims 26 and 27, drawn to methods of combination treatment with a non-selective COX1/COX2 inhibitor; and

VI. Claims 50-58, drawn to methods of identifying a compound useful for treating neuromuscular dysfunction of the lower urinary tract.

The remainder to the restriction requirement was unchanged.

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

In response to the restriction requirement set forth in the Office Action, Applicant elects to have linking claims 1-18 and 28-49 examined with invention Group I, claims 19 and 20, drawn to combination treatment with an antimuscarinic agent. The election is made without traverse.

In response to the requirement to elect species for prosecution on the merits should no generic claim be finally held to be allowable, Applicant elects the following species:

As a species of neuromuscular dysfunction of the lower urinary tract, Applicant elects the condition urinary incontinence. Elected claims 1-8, 11-20, and 31-49 read on this species.

As a species of a compound having selective affinity for the mGlu5 subtype of metabotropic glutamate receptors, Applicant elects the compound 2-(2-methylthiazol-4-yl)ethynylpyridine (MTEP). Elected claims 1-20, 41 and 42 read on this species.


As a species of an antimuscarinic agent, Applicant elects the compound tolterodine. Elected claims 19 and 20 read on this species.

All species elections are made solely for the purpose of prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Following examination of the elected species, the Examiner is requested to examine the full scope of the claims.

A prompt and favorable action of the merits of the application is solicited. Should the Examiner believe prosecution would be advanced by conducting an interview with Applicant's representative, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned representative.

Dated: October 27, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Mitchell Bernstein, Ph.D.

Registration No.: 46,550

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(212) 527-7700

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant